



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/311,254	05/13/1999	JEFFREY P. LEE	10990419-1	9998

7590 10/04/2002

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
3404 E HARMONY ROAD
P.O. BOX 272400
FORT COLLINS, CO 80528-9599

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/311,254

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

CESAR B PAULA

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-9,11-15,17 and 18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-9,11-15,17 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the application filed on 7/5/02.

This action is made Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 4, 10, and 16 have been canceled. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-15, and 17-18 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 7, and 13 are independent claims.

Drawings

3. The drawings filed on 5/13/99 have been approved by the draftsman.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 7-9, and 11-12 recite the limitation "predefined data types selected in the selection interface" in lines claim 7, 9-10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

6. Claims 13-15, and 17-18 recite the limitation "predefined data types selected in the selection interface" in claim 13, lines 9-10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

8. Claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-14, and 17-18 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mahoney et al, hereinafter Mahoney (Pat.# 5,999,664, 12/7/99, filed 11/14/97).

Regarding independent claim 1, Mahoney discloses a document analyzer for segmenting a document image into a set of layout objects—*number of regions*—and to determine a predefined document feature--*data type*-- (col. 5, lines 44-50, col.13, L.34-67, and col.24, lines 20-67, fig.9, 969).

Moreover, Mahoney teaches a selection user interface for identifying set of features for search and further processing (col.16, lines 47-col.17, line 67, col. 34, lines 1-67, fig.6, 9-10, 12-14).

Furthermore, Mahoney teaches a user interface for displaying only the selected document region including features selected by the user interface for identifying set of features for search and further processing (col. 33,line57-col.34, lines 1-67, fig.6, 9-10, 12-14).

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Mahoney discloses toggle mechanisms for enabling a user to request desired features by selecting and deselecting operations (col.24, lines 50-67, fig.9, 969).

Claim 5 is directed towards a computer system for implementing the system found in claim 2, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Mahoney discloses default selection configuration—"none"-- for enabling a user to request desired features (col.24, lines 50-67, fig.9, 969).

Claims 7-8, and 11-12 are directed towards a computer system for implementing the system found in claims 1-6 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 13-14, and 17-18 are directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claims 1-2, 2, and 6 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2176

10. Claims 3, 9, and 15 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mahoney in view of Venable (Pat.# 5,995,996, 11/30/99, filed 1/30/97).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Mahoney discloses various interfaces for carrying out several tasks—inputting document, searching, genre modeling, and feature processing—based on user selection of tasks and the interface with which it is carried out (col.7, lines 57-col.8, line 67, fig.2). Mahoney fails to explicitly disclose: *a processing pipeline identifier*. Venable teaches the invoking of a document processing pipeline for processing a document (col.8, lines 46-67). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Mahoney, and Venable, and have included this identifier to invoke the pipeline, because Venable teach above the providing a user with the ability to emulate a multi-processing pipeline in a single processing environment for document image processing (col. 3, lines 1-67).

Claim 9 is directed towards a computer system for implementing the system found in claim 3, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim 15 is directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claim 3, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 7/5/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant remarks that Mahoney does not teach or suggest the amended features of claims 1, 7, and 13 (p.4,L.1-30). The Applicant is directed towards the rejection of this newly added feature in view of Mahoney above.

Furthermore, the Applicant remarks that claims 3, 9, and 15 are rejected at least for the same reasons indicated regarding claims 1, 7, and 13 (p.5,L.6-11). The Applicant is directed towards the rejection of this newly added feature in view of Mahoney above.

Conclusion

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.



Application/Control Number: 09/311,254

Page 7

Art Unit: 2176

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Peairs (Pat. # 6,446,099), and Seaman (Pat. # 6,415,306).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Director United States Patent and Trademark Office

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

- (703) 746-7238, (for After Final communications intended for entry)
- (703) 746-7239, (for Formal communications intended for entry, except formal After Final communications)

Or:

- (703) 746-7240, (for Informal or Draft communications for discussion only, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,

Application/Control Number: 09/311,254


Page 8

Art Unit: 2176

Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

CBP

9/23/02


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER